

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

ORIGINAL

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

In the Matter of

Market Entry and Regulation of  
Foreign-Affiliated Entities

)  
) IB Docket No. 95-22  
) RM-8355  
) RM-8392

**REPLY COMMENTS OF TRANSWORLD COMMUNICATIONS (U.S.A.), INC.**

Transworld Communications (U.S.A.), Inc. ("Transworld") submits these reply comments in response to the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking of February 17, 1995, as amended by the Order of March 15, 1995, extending the response deadlines ("NPRM"). The importance of this proceeding is shown by the multitude of opening comments filed by more than 50 parties, according to our count.

In its opening comments, Transworld advocated: (1) a small U.S. carrier exemption from the proposed potential deterrent to foreign-carrier investments in emerging U.S. international carriers; (2) the avoidance of any artificial "facilities-based" carrier definition lest anti-competitive consequences result; and (3) the adoption of affirmative obligations for FCC licensees who have a propensity to file petitions to deny or delay procompetitive market entry applications. Transworld will further support the foregoing proposals in these reply comments.

**I. SMALL U.S. CARRIER EXEMPTION**

Transworld proposed an exemption of U.S. carriers with gross annual revenues from international services of less than \$125 million and control of no U.S. bottleneck facilities, from

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

044

the rules and policies proposed in the NPRM. This exemption for foreign carriers seeking to invest in emerging U.S. international carriers, would avoid the discouragement of the flow of foreign capital into this category of U.S. international carriers whose successful operations would bring procompetitive benefits to U.S. consumers.

The proposed \$125 million gross revenue threshold is identical to the one adopted by the Commission for competitive bidding eligibility for "entrepreneurs' blocks" of radio frequency bands for personal communications services. Competitive Bidding, 10 FCC Rcd 403, 415 (1994) (Fifth Memorandum Opinion and Order); 9 FCC Rcd 5532, 5600 (1994) (Fifth Report And Order). In Competitive Bidding, the FCC accorded this entrepreneurs' bidding preference because "small business concerns, which represent higher degrees of risk in financial markets than do large businesses, are experiencing increased difficulties in obtaining credit." 9 FCC Rcd supra at 5537-38. In the past, the Commission has found that emerging types of communications entities, like private satellite systems in 1990<sup>1/</sup> and cable TV systems in 1976<sup>2/</sup>, needed foreign sources of capital in order to stimulate competition for the benefit of users.

In the instant proceeding, many of the commenting parties noted that foreign sources of capital for U.S. carriers are beneficial for U.S. consumers.<sup>3/</sup> Indeed, the Commission has recognized the danger that its proposed regulations might "discourage procompetitive foreign

---

<sup>1/</sup> Orion Satellite Corporation, 5 FCC Rcd 4937, 4940 (1990).

<sup>2/</sup> Cable TV Citizenship Requirements, 59 F.C.C. 2d 723, 727 (1976).

<sup>3/</sup> Communication TeleSystems, Inc. at 3; Deutsche Telekom AG at 26-27; France Telecom at 10; LDDS Communications, Inc. at 2, 6; and Sprint Communications Company L.P. at 17.

investment." NPRM, ¶ 60. See also, NPRM ¶ 52 ("benefit from foreign carrier investment"); and NPRM ¶ 58 (desirable "ability of U.S. carriers to attract foreign investments").

If the Commission decides to adopt the rules and policies proposed in the NPRM, the public interest would be served by the inclusion of the small U.S. carrier exemption proposed herein.

## **II. FACILITIES-BASED CARRIER DEFINITION**

In its opening comments, Transworld urged the Commission to avoid any artificial "facilities-based" carrier definition [which apparently would require ownership rather than lease even of the U.S. common carrier cable half circuit (NPRM, ¶ 71)] because foreign carriers are often more reluctant to grant operating agreements to U.S. carriers classified by the FCC as resellers rather than as facilities-based carriers.

Absent foreign carrier operating agreements, emerging U.S. international carriers often turn to the alternative of becoming their own foreign correspondents. Such U.S. carriers, however, cannot obtain FCC authority to interconnect foreign leased half circuits into the U.S. public switched telephone network ("PSTN"), unless the foreign country involved has been found to qualify under the FCC's "equivalency requirement" established in the International Resale Policy Decision, 7 FCC Rcd 559, 561-62 (1991). See, NPRM, ¶ 77. To date, the Commission has granted such equivalency status only to two countries, Canada and the U.K.

Therefore, emerging U.S. international carriers wishing to become their own foreign correspondents in all of the other foreign countries are relegated to providing international private line ("IPL") service. However, if customers need to interconnect their IPLs into the U.S. PSTN at the international carriers' U.S. central operating offices, the fact that the U.S. carriers can only lease rather than own their foreign half circuits may preclude their offering of this more marketable category of IPL service. See opening comments of IDB Communications, Inc. at 25-30.<sup>4/</sup>

The adoption of the NPRM's proposed "facilities-based" carrier definition could become a triple-edged sword that might be used to sever all competitive alternatives available to emerging U.S. international carriers. First, the own-rather-than-lease requirement for the U.S. common carrier cable half circuits could thwart these carriers' endeavors to obtain foreign carrier operating agreements. Second, the own-rather-than-lease requirement for the foreign common carrier cable half circuits could prevent the emerging U.S. international carriers from becoming their own foreign correspondents for U.S. PSTN-interconnected services everywhere except Canada and the U.K. Third, the same barrier, mentioned in the preceding sentence, could apply to IPL circuits interconnected into the U.S. PSTN at the U.S. central operating offices of the emerging U.S. international carriers. Accordingly, the Commission is respectfully requested to

---

<sup>4/</sup> "It bears emphasis that the Commission's current policy, as articulated in CC Docket No. 90-337, is to permit U.S. business customers to engage in facilities-based IPL interconnection through central office interconnection. That policy would be effectively overturned if the Commission defined all 'foreign leased circuits' to be a resale activity subject to the IPL resale policy. In so doing, the Commission would have effectively granted AT&T's petition for reconsideration in CC Docket No. 90-337, Phase II, seeking an expansion of the IPL resale policy to prohibit IPL interconnection at carriers' central offices." IDB Comments, supra, at 27.

avoid these anticompetitive consequences that would flow from the adoption of the proposed "facilities-based" carrier definition.

### **III. AFFIRMATIVE OBLIGATIONS FOR CARRIER PETITIONERS**


As explained in Transworld's opening comments, if the Commission were to adopt elaborate foreign carrier market entry rules, FCC licensees who have a propensity to file petitions to deny or delay market entry applications could frivolously invoke such rules to restrain competition. Accordingly, Transworld proposed that the Commission amend Sections 1.65 and 63.52(c) of its Rules to require full, complete, updated and verified disclosure of the petitioning carrier's exact operational capabilities and negotiating status with respect to the foreign countries cited by such petitioning carriers.

Transworld referred to the actions by Columbia Communications Corporation ("Columbia") (1) in filing almost 20 near-identical petitions in a 18-month span to deny or delay applications by various carriers, including Transworld; and (2) in failing to bring to the Commission's attention the most currently available relevant information. Columbia's opening comments, at 3, in the instant proceeding urge the Commission to expand the scope of the NPRM's proposals. If the agency were to adopt Columbia's proposals regarding the vague concept of "landing rights" (*Id.*), Columbia's continued, unsubstantiated harassment of applicants would be encouraged.

Accordingly, Transworld reiterates its request that the Commission impose affirmative obligations upon FCC licensees who have a propensity to file petitions to deny or delay market entry applications.

Respectfully submitted,

**TRANSWORLD COMMUNICATIONS  
(U.S.A.), INC.**

By:   
Robert E. Conn  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge  
2300 N Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037  
(202) 663-8093

May 12, 1995

168934-01 / DOCSDC1